1	Kenneth A. Gallo (pro hac vice)	
2	Joseph J. Simons ( <i>pro hac vice</i> ) Craig A. Benson ( <i>pro hac vice</i> )	
3	PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISO	N LLP
4	2001 K Street, NW Washington, DC 20006-1047	
5	Telephone: (202) 223-7300 Facsimile: (202) 223-7420	
6	Email: kgallo@paulweiss.com	
7	Email: jsimons@paulweiss.com Email: cbenson@paulweiss.com	
8	Stephen E. Taylor (SBN 058452)	
9	Jonathan A. Patchen (SBN 237346) TAYLOR & COMPANY LAW OFFICES, LLP	
10	One Ferry Building, Suite 355 San Francisco, California 94111	
11	Telephone: (415) 788-8200	
12	Facsimile: (415) 788-8208 Email: staylor@tcolaw.com	
13	Email: jpatchen@tcolaw.com	
14	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Sharp Electronics Corporation and Sharp Electronics Manufacturing Company of America, Inc.	
15	LINITED OT A TEC DIOT	DICT COUDT
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
17	SAN FRANCISCO	DIVISION
18		
19	IN RE CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)	Case No. 07-cv-5944 SC
20	ANTITRUST LITIGATION	MDL No. 1917
21	This Document Relates to:	PLAINTIFFS SHARP ELECTRONICS CORPORATION &
22	Sharp Electronics Corp., et al. v. Hitachi, Ltd., et al.,	SHARP ELECTRONICS
23	Case No. 13-cv-1173 SC	MANUFACTURING COMPANY OF AMERICA, INC.'S OPPOSITION
24	and	TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 3
25	Sharp Electronics Corp., et al. v. Koninklijke Philips Electronics N.V., et al., Case No. 13-cv-2776 SC.	Hearing Date: None set
26	<i>Licentonies</i> 11.1., et al., ease 110. 13-01-27/0 SC.	Judge: Hon. Samuel Conti
27		
1		

1	Defendants' Motion in Limine No. 3 should be denied. With this motion, Defendants		
2	seek to exclude in advance any and all evidence or reference to the U.S. Department of Justice		
3	("DOJ") investigations into the CRT conspiracy. This motion is premature and overbroad.		
4	Whether references to the DOJ investigation are appropriate or are hearsay cannot be determined		
5	without appropriate understanding of the context for which they would be offered, and that		
6	context cannot be known until trial. Colton Crane Co., LLC v. Terex Cranes Wilmington, Inc.,		
7	No. CV 08-8525 PSG (PJWx), 2010 WL 2035800, at *1 (C.D. Cal. May 19, 2010) ("[M]otions		
8	in limine should rarely seek to exclude broad categories of evidence, as the court is almost		
10	always better situated to rule on evidentiary issues in their factual context during trial.").		
11	For the foregoing reasons, Sharp Electronics Corporation and Sharp Electronics		
12	Manufacturing Company of America, Inc. respectfully request that the Court deny Defendants'		
13	Motion in Limine No. 3.		
14			
15	DATED: February 27, 2015 By: /s/ <u>Craig A. Benson</u>		
16			
17	Kenneth A. Gallo (pro hac vice) Joseph J. Simons (pro hac vice)		
18	Craig A. Benson (pro hac vice)		
19	PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP 2001 K Street, NW		
20	Washington, DC 20006		
21	Telephone: (202) 223-7300		
	Facsimile: (202) 223-7420 kgallo@paulweiss.com		
22	jsimons@paulweiss.com		
23	cbenson@paulweiss.com		
24	Stephen E. Taylor (SBN 058452)		
25	Jonathan A. Patchen (SBN 237346)  TAYLOR & COMPANY LAW OFFICES, LLP		
	One Ferry Building, Suite 355		
26	San Francisco, California 94111		
27	Telephone: (415) 788-8200 Facsimile: (415) 788-8208		
	2		

2

## Case 3:13-cv-02776-JST Document 29 Filed 02/27/15 Page 3 of 3

Email: staylor@tcolaw.com Email: jpatchen@tcolaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs Sharp Electronics Corporation and Sharp Electronics Manufacturing Company of America, Inc.